

R E M A R K S

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. Previously, claims 1-29 and 33-44 were pending. In the Office Action mailed February 25, 2004, claims 26-29, 34 and 36-44 have been allowed, claims 1-25 have been rejected and claims 33 and 35 have been objected to. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 33 and 35 and submitted the following remarks. Accordingly, claims 1-29 and 33-44 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Claim Objections

Claims 33 and 35 have been objected to because they currently depend from canceled claims. By the above amendments, the Applicants have amended claims 33 and 35 to depend from the independent claim 26. The independent claim 26 has been allowed. Accordingly, claims 33 and 35 and 43-44 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 10-15 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,191,971 to Dischert et al. (hereinafter Dischert). In particular, it is asserted within the Office Action that claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 are anticipated in that Dischert discloses an apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras, comprising first a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the present invention includes a multiplexer that receives video signals directly from video cameras, as the multiplexer is directly in a path between the video cameras and the video decoder. Referring to figure 3 of the present invention, it is apparent that the **video cameras 302, 304, 306** directly provide the **multiplexer 308** with video signals **before the video signals ever reach the video decoder 310**. In contrast to the present invention as disclosed and claimed, in figure 1 Dischert discloses video cameras 17, 217 providing video signals to camera processors 21, 221, **not to the camera selector switch 220**. In fact, the camera selector switch 220 in Dischert provides only output cables 241, 242 for disabling the camera processors 21, 221, and does not receive a video signal. In fact, the structure in figure 1 of Dischert more closely resembles figure 2 of the present invention which

depicts the prior art than it does the structure described and claimed in figure 3 of the present invention.

It is also asserted within the Office Action that claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 are anticipated in that Dischert discloses video decoder coupled to the selector for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Dischert does not teach a video decoder coupled to the selector for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals.

Dischert discloses a transmission line cable terminated at both ends and routed through a plurality of separate television cameras and a television monitor. Each camera includes a current source coupled to the cable. The video from the camera modulates the current source to produce a signal across the terminations without changing the impedance across the line [Dischert, Abstract].

However, Dischert does not teach a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals. In fact, in figure 1 Dischert teaches a camera selector switch 220 having two output cables 241, 242 for instructing camera processors 21 & 221 to disable the camera [Dischert, col. 3, lines 48-51]. Furthermore, the cameras 17, 217 are coupled to and send the video signal to the camera processors 21, 221, not to the camera selector switch 220 [Dischert, col. 2, lines 48-52].

Dischert also does not teach a video decoder coupled to the selector for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals. As stated previously, Dischert teaches a camera selector switch 220 having two output cables 241, 242 for instructing camera processors 21, 221 to disable the camera [Dischert, col. 3, lines 48-51]. Therefore, the components that the Office Action claims are video decoders (camera processors 21, 221), actually receive instruction signals from the camera selector switch 220, not video signals, as is suggested in the Office Action.

In contrast to the teachings of Dischert, the apparatus and method of receiving video signals from video cameras of the present invention includes video cameras each coupled to provide a video signal to a respective input of a multiplexer. The multiplexer routes a selected one of the video signals to a video decoder. The video decoder receives the selected video signal and is conditioned according to the video signal. This includes synchronizing the video decoder to a frequency and phase of the video signal, controlling a gain level for the video signal and adjusting a dc clamping level for dc restoration of the video signal. Parameters representative of each of these quantities are stored in association with the identity of the corresponding video camera. The video decoder also places each video signal into a format suitable for storage in a storage device

and for display by a display device. As the multiplexer is utilized to cycle through the cameras according to a sequence, the parameters for each camera are retrieved and utilized to initialize the video decoder for decoding the video signal received from the corresponding camera. As a result, the amount of time required to condition the video decoder according to the video signal received from each camera is significantly reduced. [Abstract of the Present Invention]

The independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 1 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, Dischert does not teach a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Dischert does not teach a video decoder coupled to the selector for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Dischert.

Claims 2-6 depend from the independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Dischert. Accordingly, claims 2-6 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent claim 10 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 10 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a plurality of parameters representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, Dischert does not teach a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Dischert does not teach a video decoder coupled to the selector for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 10 is allowable over the teachings of Dischert.

Claims 11-15 and 22 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Dischert. Accordingly, claims 11-15 and 22 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dischert. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 18 depends from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Dischert. Accordingly, claim 18 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 7, 16-17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dischert in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,139 to Cooper et al. (hereinafter Cooper). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 7, 16-17 and 23 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Dischert. Accordingly, claims 7, 16-17 and 23 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 8-9 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dischert in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,659 to Vincent (hereinafter Vincent). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 8-9 and 24-25 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Dischert. Accordingly, claims 8-9 and 24-25 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dischert in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,167,021 to Holmes (hereinafter Holmes). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 19-21 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Dischert. Accordingly, claims 19-21 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 5-21-04

By: Thomas B. Haverstock

Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No. 32,571
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

ENCLOSURE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Date: 5-21-04

By: [Signature]